



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the same ground. Art is the maker of men, of spiritual men. And perhaps it is a maker in a far-reaching sense that few of us dream of. Perhaps the poetic capacity which lies dormant in each one of us, is the earnest of a world to come where we shall enjoy the ideas of Plato by progressive effort. Perhaps our surroundings in the coming life will be all of our own making and we shall mould circumstances to our desires—a life-process which is foreshadowed, very likely, by the doctrine of the sensuous world as a product of our thoughts which is feigned in the imagination of many a philosopher. But the doctrine for the hour is that life and learning should not be separated and that all men's efforts should be a striving towards the creation of a distinctively human atmosphere which high and low alike can breathe.

M. E. ROBINSON.

BANGOR, N. WALES.

THE SOCIAL VALUE OF TRADE UNIONISM.

IN the United States to-day there are one million and a half of trade unionists and their number is growing with tropical rapidity. All of them are adults and the overwhelming majority of them men. They form an intelligent, disciplined, well-ordered army, strong enough to dictate legislation in both Congress and the industrial States, able to paralyze the whole country should they go on strike together, capable of improving the intelligence and status of manual labor should they be wisely governed. They will form a permanent feature of our social life whether the future industrial development be Individualistic, Corporate or Socialistic. Their influence must be out of proportion to their numbers, for exclusive of the farmers, they include the most skilled and intelligent of the workers, and their increase is favored by that growth of cities which is a characteristic of our epoch. Should they appreciate their possible political power they could create a Labor party which would be the most formidable third party since the Civil War and would possibly supersede the Democratic party. They are

better united to-day in the American Federation of Labor—with stronger, shrewder leaders, with a saner policy and with larger funds than they ever had before. Their strength and politic tactics have now forced the courteous consideration of trust magnates; their magazines receive contributions from the ablest economists; their meetings are reported in friendly spirit by the most influential papers. Altogether they form a potent factor in our social and industrial life.

Therefore it is valuable to consider what is the influence of Trade Unionism on the character of its adherents and on the ethical standards of the nation. Fenianism was strong but pernicious; some new religious sects have a million of adherents, but all may be besotted with superstition. Does loyalty to trade union principles affect the morality of a workman? Does it make him a fitter citizen? Would a State wholly organized on Trade Union principles be better or worse than a State in which freedom of competition between individual laborers was unchecked and unguarded? These are the questions to be considered in this article.

The trade union grows as manufacturing industry develops. It did not appear in the States as a continuous organization before 1825. Till the Civil War it had a precarious life not only because the old law of conspiracy made it illegal, but because the industrial conditions were unfavorable to its development. So long as the inhabitants of the country were either farmers tilling their own land, slaves without political liberty, or artisans who could move away and take a farm, there was not the division of industrial classes, the permanent separation between the capitalist and the workman, upon which the union is founded. Only when there arose classes of laborers who must accept service under others as their life portion did trade unionism become a necessity. Therefore its establishment denoted the growth of a new class-consciousness. In Europe this class-consciousness was more marked before Trade Unionism was founded; there the unions indicated the effort of the workmen to establish themselves in a higher class. But in America the very existence of the union denotes a class division which did not exist among the Puritans. This class

division was the result of economic changes beyond the control of the workers. In itself it is perhaps a lower moral state than the social homogeneity which preceded it, because the economic solidarity of a people favors kindly relations, the development of fine feelings, more than class separation can do. Each decade the line of cleavage has struck wider and deeper. Trade Unionism immediately follows the creation of the class division between master and workman; the forces which produce the fissure produce also the union; and, therefore, confounding effect with cause, some have accused Unionism of making class divisions, of "setting class against class." But the birth of the unions is only the recognition of an economic fact, not its origin. The opposition of the immediate economic interests of the buyers and sellers of labor is developed historically; the unions are established afterwards to secure for the seller a fair price, to protect the weaker party in the bargaining.

But, granting the inevitableness of the class divisions, do the unions accentuate them and aggravate division into hostility? Doubtless the unions are based on the conviction that the individual workman is at such a disadvantage in bargaining with the employer that, left alone, he will, in the long run, be oppressed. He has neither the power of holding out, the knowledge of the conditions of the market, nor the practice in the art of bargaining necessary to get a fair price for his labor. His union teaches that the average employer will necessarily take advantage of this weakness to drive down wages to the minimum of subsistence and that the humane employer, unless specially protected by patents or other bulwarks, will be driven by competition to fix wages as low as his harshest competitor. This danger to the isolated workman increases as the consolidation of capital proceeds. "The alarming development and aggressiveness of great capitalists and corporations, unless checked, will inevitably lead to the pauperization and hopeless degradation of the toiling masses," says the preamble to the constitution of the Knights of Labor. In similar spirit the declaration of principles adopted by the American Federation of Labor at its formation in 1881 was to the effect that "a

struggle is going on in the nations of the civilized world between the oppressors and the oppressed of all countries; a struggle between capital and labor which grows in intensity from year to year, and will work disastrous results to the toiling millions if they are not combined for mutual protection and benefit." The unions, by declaring this struggle, however, do not arouse it. In districts where there are no unions it is sometimes keenest and its incidents most savage. In the anthracite coal regions of Pennsylvania, for instance, there was hardly any organization of the men from 1887, when the Assembly of the Knights of Labor was defeated and destroyed, down to 1900 when the United Mine Workers made rapid headway in the district. But nowhere was the struggle "between the oppressors and the oppressed" more bitter and remorseless, though the men were so helpless they could not fight in a way to draw general public attention. Their wages were lowered, they were charged exorbitant rates for their powder, truck or "pluck me" stores flourished, and they were forced to mine more than 3000 pounds to a ton. Economic oppression was there, though it was not accompanied by picturesque strikes over wide areas. Peace reigned in Pennsylvania as peace reigned in Warsaw according to the despatch of the Russian general after its desolation.

This brings us to consider the social influence of the unions in their attitude towards the workmen's final appeal, industrial strikes. Granting the hostility between the capitalist and the worker, does not the union, by precipitating needless strikes and harassing industry, keep open the conflict and arouse fiercer passions?

Unquestionably the unions are organized to fight in the last resort by withholding the labor of their members simultaneously. The right and the power to do this is of the essence of their being. The American Federation of Labor declared at Denver in 1900 in an appeal to the wage workers of North America: "While reducing strikes to a minimum, yet to resist a wrong or to obtain a right, as a last resort, it (the Federation) strikes, and through that method, as well as by legislative and political action, prevents the curtailment of the lib-

erties of a portion of the people for the advancement of another. Though strikes do not always win, even those that are lost at least induce employers to forbear and teach a lesson not soon forgotten—that labor is the most important factor in production, and is entitled to consideration and consultation regarding the conditions under which labor shall be performed, and thus the union paves the way to conciliation and prevents disputes.”

The Knights of Labor, that numbered a million members at the zenith of their prosperity and have now dwindled to insignificance, finally lost their hold on the workers when they accompanied the refusal to allow national organization of trades with the declaration that “It is but a step from a National Trade Assembly to a national Trade Union and trade unions and strikes are relics of barbarism not to be tolerated by the Knights of Labor.” So soon as the toilers found that the Knights, by their unwillingness or their inability to support the final arbitrament of war, were, in the last resort, unable to help their members effectually, the fate of the organization was sealed.

But, though the unions, like nations with armies, have the purpose to fight rather than yield their rights, they know the cost of conflict and almost always prefer peaceful negotiation to armed combat. The stronger the union the less likely it is to enter lightly upon a strike. Young unions, that have not cut their wisdom teeth, rush most readily into battle; and where there are no unions spasmodic rebellions are of frequent occurrence. Just as between small tribes skirmishes are common, while between great nations a war is too frightful to be begun light-heartedly, so where the workers are disorganized the disputes are frequent while great International Unions wage war but rarely. On the lower East Side of New York, among the unorganized or semi-organized immigrant workers, there is hardly a week without a strike; but the national Union of Bricklayers, an old and powerful organization, has not supported a strike from the National Treasury since 1894. The leaders are more cautious than the rank and file and labor incessantly to avert disputes. At the miners’ convention at

Indianapolis this year the delegates were unwilling to accept the terms offered by the operators and only by the urgent arguments and entreaties of Mr. Mitchell and his fellow officers was a wide-spread struggle postponed. The organ of the Boot and Shoe workers, in a recent number declared: "In arriving at a decision as to permitting a strike it should always be remembered that a strike is a dead loss to employer, to employed and to the community." And the British Federation of Trade Unions, founded in 1899, makes this explicit statement: "The existence of the federation is not a menace to the industrial peace of the country, but a guarantee that everything will be done to avoid dispute; this being not only the policy of the Management Committee, but distinctly set forth as the first object of the Federation. Such peace cannot be obtained by want of organization on one or both sides, but by organization on both. Our desire is, therefore, for peace."

These declarations genuinely represent the trade union spirit. They cannot be overthrown unless the critics of the unions can answer the challenge of Mr. Gompers, the President of the Federation of Labor, "Has any labor organization ever refused to deal with representatives chosen by employers?"

In the course of economic evolution, I have said, the division between masters and workmen arose without the formal consent of either. This, among other social results, has followed. The owners and managers of big factories and corporations cannot maintain personal relations with their workmen without more self-sacrifice than they are usually able and willing to make. The men become "hands" to them; they become "money bags" to the men. Under these circumstances it is a social gain if a medium of communication can be provided through which masters and men can treat with each other as equal human beings and talk over their difficulties in a friendly spirit. The trade union supplies such a medium, which is being utilized, more than it ever was before, by the arbitration committee of the National Civic Federation with Senator Hanna as its chairman. But here and there its value was previously recognized. The coal owners who have their offices in New York, Chicago and Pittsburg cannot individually meet

the quarter of a million of miners scattered through Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Virginia; but at the annual conference hundreds of representative miners and owners meet for a week's open discussion and friendly intercourse. The representatives of each side return to their districts acquainted not only with the arguments of the other side but with its personnel. Owners find that picked "hands" are capable gentlemen, and the workmen learn that operators may be kindly good fellows. Such personal knowledge allays the ill feeling which would make the peaceful settlement of disputes impossible. Without the union this negotiation through representatives would be impracticable and would, indeed, not have been desired. The union offers the only means available when industry is organized on a large scale for adding the human to the cash relationship, for bridging under competitive conditions the fissure which economic forces have caused.

A further advantage to society of the existence of the unions lies in the fact that they are great schools of democracy, training their members in the art of self government more effectively than the regular political organizations. Few citizens attend the primaries, which, in the cities especially, are arranged for the suppression rather than the cultivation of self government. Even in the small New England township, where the town meeting is really open, it comes so seldom and attracts so few citizens that the educational influence is small. But the Trade Union weekly local meeting, with rare exceptions, must be attended for the payment of dues. I have heard unionists speak with fine scorn of embryo women's organizations in New York because they need to send round an officer to collect the dues in the workshops. At the meeting there is absolute equality among the members—free expression of opinion, decision by majority vote, and unrestricted choice of officers. No "boss" dictates the nominations. The practice in self-control, the necessity to give and take, and the friction of minds upon questions that directly affect each member's interests are an unsurpassed training for general citizenship. The government of the National Unions has a like result. The National Conventions are democratically representative, but

the tendency in America is to submit all important decisions to a referendum vote of the members. In England more power is given to the representatives because the wide scope of the referendum was at first so much abused as to hinder unduly the dispatch of business. But in both cases the delegates, who are usually the pick of the local officers, show a dignity of bearing, a businesslike habit in debate and a knowledge of the subjects they discuss equal, if not superior to, the behavior of members of Congress, of the House of Commons, or of the Chamber of Deputies.

The union thus cultivates in the members a power of coöperation, a sense of solidarity within the trade. Now the power of coöperation, the social instinct, is at once a sign and an essential of social progress. In the words of Karl Pearson: "If the struggle for existence has not led to the dominant portion of a given community having strong social instincts, then that community, if not already in a decadent condition, is wanting in the chief element of permanent stability. It is the prevalence of the social instinct in the dominant portion of the given community which is the sole and yet perfectly efficient sanction to the observance of social, that is, moral, lines of conduct." Of course the unionist's social instinct, as a unionist, is limited. It does not embrace the whole nation any more than the statesman's embraces more countries than his own. But to bring the unionist to consider his fellows in the trade, and, through Federation, his fellows in all trades, is a great social gain over the condition when "his hand was against everyone and everyone's hand was against his." This trade solidarity sometimes involves sacrifice, but it stands the test. For instance, when the Flint Glass workers of England established a uniform national scale of wages the members at York first protested because it would bring to them a reduction of wages; but when the advantages of the system to the other members was explained to them they accepted the sacrifice and, in the words of their journal "the vote against the catalogue was only the miserable total of nine." In the rich thick-veined mines of Southern Illinois the miners were formerly receiving the lowest wages in the State; and their

fellows in the northern, poorer mines, in order to equalize competitive conditions and give the miners in all districts a chance of employment, have now helped them to get higher wages than they themselves get. To raise your fellow from a lower to a higher position than yourself chiefly for the benefit of thousands of men you have never seen, is a display of trade solidarity that has a high moral value.

Here we meet with an answer on the ethical side to the objection that Trade Unionism prevents a specially good workman from getting extra pay. The charge is false in fact, for the union sets only a minimum, not a maximum; but even if it were true it would surely be to the credit of the man of finer skill that he should belong to a union and sacrifice his personal profit for the general good. It is paradoxical that teachers and moralists should object to his action, since any personal renunciation for the good of the whole is socially, that is morally, advantageous. Especially in a sympathetic strike this subordination of self to society is often shown in heroic proportions. Men who, content with their own conditions of labor, will leave their work and face starvation that they may help some of their fellows to break what they deem oppression are displaying a social sense of high value whatever the economic results may be. "I am my brother's keeper" is a maxim adopted more thoroughly by the trade unions than by the churches. Whenever a strike is raging, though some are deterred from returning to work against orders though their selfish interest or the fear of boycott and punishment, most are restrained by loyalty to their union, by their sense of duty to their fellows. A "blackleg" is the meanest creature in the trade union inferno because the "blackleg" is guilty of anti-social behavior.

So far I have considered the directions in which the action of the unions is socially advantageous. But, adopting the same line of argument, their action in other directions must be condemned. If the social value of the union depends largely upon its cultivation of the social sense, upon the feeling of mutual interdependence among the members, evidently this value is curtailed by any exclusive action. American unions are oc-

casionally guilty of an exclusiveness which is as selfish as it is short-sighted. Though the commonest rates of initiation fee range from \$1 to \$5 a few strong organizations levy considerably higher rates. The bricklayers charge \$10, \$15, \$20, or more. The painters of New York charge \$25. The Theatrical Stage Employés, in places where they monopolize their occupation, charge \$25 and sometimes even \$50. Small, local, highly-paid unions have virtually closed their ranks by demanding as much as \$100. Sometimes they discriminate against immigrants. The Flint Glass Workers admit Americans for \$3; but foreigners must pay \$50; the Glass Bottle Blowers ordinarily charge Americans \$5 and foreigners \$50 to \$100, according to the decision of the general officers, the door being half-opened or tightly closed as the monopoly spirit dictates. Such a policy has been forbidden to the local branches by the National Garment Workers' Unions and is condemned by the best leaders because, in the end, it is detrimental to the union's own interests. In addition it limits the union's social usefulness by shutting out some members of the trade from friendly consideration, by outlawing them through no fault of their own. When immigrants are thus forbidden to work at their trade the morality of the exclusion is the same as when one people forbids a weaker people to establish manufactures. It is a repetition of the tyranny of England towards Ireland and America in the eighteenth century, a recrudescence of monarchical methods in a democratic organization, as certain to bring revolt and defeat as they did to George III.

However, these cases are not typical and to the off-setting credit of the unions must be reckoned their constant efforts in the textile, iron, steel, coal and other industries to get all immigrants into their organization, the noble aid they have given to the Americanizing of this raw material, and the stubborn resistance of the American Federation of Labor to discrimination against colored workers in the South. It not only refuses to admit to the Federation any union which excludes colored workers, but it sends out organizers to convert the African to American industrial democracy. Monopolistic action, copied from the methods of the trusts, is strongest in small

unions that have control in limited areas. As the size of the industry increases and more groups of workers are consulted the tendency to exclusion dissipates until, in the Federation of unions, which has under its shelter all organized manual workers, it is thoroughly discountenanced.

The same tendency to exclusiveness is observable sometimes in the regulations limiting the number of apprentices and in the hostility to trade schools. In both cases some oversight by the unions is requisite to their own existence. A large oversupply of labor in any trade, especially if it be only half-skilled, can be used as a hammer by employers to beat down wages and the reserves may be rallied during a dispute to destroy the men's organization. Apprentices so-called are too often boy workers who are taught nothing systematically, are allowed to pick up only a fraction of a trade, and are then set to work at this fraction continuously that they may produce a man's output at a boy's wages. Trade Schools, if unregulated, may equip a quite unnecessary number of men in the few trades they teach, who will either be unable to obtain work or will drive out others, in each case increasing the number of the unemployed in the trade and making the drain on the union's funds for out-of-work benefits more exhausting.

With respect to apprenticeship the unions attempt restriction which is socially disadvantageous only when it becomes excessive. The ratio of apprentices to journeymen most commonly enforced is one to five, a proportion sufficient to double the number in the trade every fifteen years—ample to replace the natural waste and to allow for the expected increase in population. But sometimes the ratio desired is one to ten and occasionally as low as one to fifteen is named. Such rules, if universally enforced, would cause the depletion of the trade and the gradual loss to the community of the skill its workmen transmit from generation to generation. Therefore they are anti-social, or immoral, not only through their denial of the right to learn a trade to the unionists' and their fellow-worker's children, but through the injury they inflict on society at large. They are contrary to what I have shown to be the essentially fraternal spirit of unionism.

Towards Trade Schools the feeling of the Unionist forces, in New York, for instance, has been frankly hostile. Refusing to follow the lead of their officials, men more far-sighted and statesmanlike than the rank and file, they have declined to countenance the schools by accepting invitations to help in managing them. Their hope and desire has been to prevent the formation of new schools, to compel the old schools to close their doors, and to force learners to rely on apprenticeship for mastering their craft. The social result of this attitude depends upon the circumstances. Apprenticeship, as a mode of replenishing trades, seems to be dying out; but the unionists, conservative by instinct and fondly thinking that their tedious apprenticeship gives the value to their skill, are reluctant to recognize the distasteful fact. Their own fundamental principles logically adopted require that they shall eagerly send their delegates to the Boards of Management of Trade Schools, that they may there insist on thorough training and the adjustment of the numbers to the requirements of the trade; and that the unions shall welcome with friendly handshake the workman who by his skill can prove his fitness for union membership.

Since organization requires intelligence, fidelity, and mutual trust, the ablest workers, in the main, organize first. They then secure more favorable conditions of work even than the better intelligence of the individuals would win, and the superiority and security of their position tends to make them neglectful of the wider interests of the manual workers as a whole. So far as this tendency takes effect it limits their social usefulness and they are open to the taunt of being an aristocracy of labor, of making class-divisions instead of bridging them. Some strong societies, such as the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, have refused to federate with their fellows and are practically a superior caste, with high wages, large mutual insurance funds, and some scorn for underlings. But this attitude is exceptional. The vast majority of the unionists, through the Federation of Labor, employ labor missionaries to go into dark industrial regions and carry the good news of unionism to the unconverted. Thirty-five of these mission-

aries are under salary and give their whole time to the work, while over eight hundred give their leisure time for small payments disproportionate to their efforts. This proselytizing is a sign of a praiseworthy, noble desire to bring all the manual workers under one banner and to bind them together by the strongest bonds of mutual interest. In proportion as it succeeds the spirit of economic solidarity extends. The limits of the operation of this spirit are very wide. It may include brain as well as manual workers. Already the teachers of England have their union; and as the great industry continually enlarges the size of the industrial unit the number of employers decreases, the brain workers are also subordinated to capital, they become an educated proletariat such as exists to-day in Germany, and for self-protection they also must organize. Gradually, then, an increasing proportion of the population and a greater variety of callings are brought into the army of unionism.

The spirit of the movement is splendidly inclusive. It overleaps mountains and rivers; it passes State boundaries; it is blind to distinctions of race; it is as strong a cementing force as nationality. When the Australians telegraphed large sums to aid the London Dockers in their strike and when French and German unions interchanged fraternal greetings, they showed that this spirit can overcome national rancour and can engirdle the earth. It promises to be one of the forces to promote International peace. Already many American unions have branches in both the States and Canada, all under one general management, and the Machinists and the Carpenters have lodges with common funds in England, America and the British colonies. Such trade solidarity, as it increases, will be effective to check the hostility produced by the fight for markets between the commercial classes of different countries. Men in allied unions will not sanction war with their brother workers in other countries any more than New York bricklayers would take up arms against Chicago bricklayers or the tobacco growers of Connecticut would forcibly invade the tobacco States of the South. The delegations now exchanged between the conventions of the National Trade Union Federa-

tions of America, England, France, Germany and Belgium will probably lead to closer alliance for mutual service, an alliance which may supersede political treaties and may be more effective for International friendship than the leagues of potentates and the resolutions of parliaments.

JOHN MARTIN.

NEW YORK.

THE CONVERSION OF ST. AUGUSTINE.

IT is a singular fact that no humanist writer of recent years has been tempted to give us a psychological and ethical study of St. Augustine. The great bishop of Hippo appeals to all time, not only as a commanding and interesting personality, but as one who lived at a notable crisis in the intellectual, religious, and political development of Europe, and who sprang forward with alacrity to meet every movement of his day. In this there is obvious promise of deep human interest; yet the life of the Afro-Roman bishop has been entirely abandoned to writers who sacrifice both psychology and ethics to the requirements of a narrow theology. There are capable studies of his intellectual side—Reuter's "Augustinische Studien," Grandgeorge's "S. Augustin," and especially Nourisson's "Philosophie de S. Augustin,"—but these partial inquiries only suggest, particularly where they deal with ethical opinions, the larger interest of the complete study. Germany has only given us biographies of the usual perverse ecclesiastical type, the chief of which are the works of Bindemann and Cardinal Von Rauscher. The principal French life is from the pen of a layman, M. Poujoulat; but it is a work that seems eager to redeem the laity of the writer by a surcharge of the conventional psychology of a saint. In England the only work of use in any direction is written by an Irish priest. All these works are constructed on the same perverse *à priori* form. Up to the time of his conversion Augustine must be portrayed in uniformly dark colors. Then, of a sudden and with utter contempt of all the laws of the psychologist, the flood-gates of light and